## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action dated October 16, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4.

With this Amendment, claims 1-4 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment.

## I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002 0145695) Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claims require a liquid crystal display apparatus that includes a plurality of vertical signal lines, a plurality of horizontal signal lines and a display pixel located where one of the vertical signal lines and one of the horizontal signal lines intersect. Additionally, the claims require a shield wire on each side of the vertical signal lines and on each side of the horizontal signal lines. As a result of disposing a shield wire on each side of the vertical signal lines and horizontal signal lines, the coupling noise is reduced, which prevents the rounding of a signal waveform due to the coupling noise. Specification, page 13. This, in turn, improves the image quality of the liquid crystal display apparatus. *Id*.

Kim et al. teaches a liquid crystal display that includes a vertical data wire (70), a horizontal gate line (20) with a pixel electrode located at the intersection of the data wire and the gate line. Kim et al., paragraph [0040] & Fig. 1A. Kim et al. also teaches that the pixel is divided into three partitions (91, 92 & 93) and storage electrode wires are located in-between the partitions. *Id.* Additionally, storage electrode wires are located between the pixel and the gate line and the data wire. Kim et al. does not, however, teach or even fairly suggest shield wires located on both sides of the vertical signal lines and horizontal signal lines as required by the

Response to October 16, 2008 Office Action

Application No. 10/599,773

Page 5

claims. Thus, independent claims 1 and 2 are patentable over the cited reference as are dependent

claims 3 and 4 for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the

above rejection be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are

clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable

notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 14, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger

Registration No. 32,919

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

- 5 -